

Serial No. 09/760,560

Reply to Final Office Action of October 28, 2005

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed October 28, 2005, Applicant has studied the Examiner's comments and the cited art. Claims 1, 4-14, 17-22, 24-28, 30, 32-36, and 38 are currently pending; as a result of this Amendment, claims 1, 4-9, 11-14, 17-22, 25-28, 30, and 32-34 remain pending. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance.

Amendments

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 14 to include the limitations of now-cancelled dependent claims 10 and 24, respectively. Applicant has similarly amended claim 28.

Applicant has further amended the dependency of claims 11-12 and 25-26, which previously depended on now-cancelled claims 10 and 24 to depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively, to correspond to the cancellation of claims 10 and 24. The amendments do not change the scope of the claims.

Applicant has cancelled claims 35-36 and 38.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejection claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the claim was incomplete. Applicant inadvertently omitted a portion of claim 9 in the Response and Amendment filed August 10, 2005. No amendment of claim 9 was intended by that Response, and Applicant has provided claim 9 in complete form in this Office Action. Claim 9 remains as originally filed. For this reason, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-5, 14, 17-18, 22, 28, 33-36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,275,546 B1. Applicant has cancelled claims 35-36 and 38 and respectfully traverses the rejections of the remaining claims.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 14 to include the limitations of their respective dependent claims 10 and 24, which the Office Action indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has similarly amended claim 28, adding corresponding method limitations describing the step of synchronizing the first input clock signal, the second input clock signal, and step (c). Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 4-5, 17-18, 22, 28, and 33-34 depend from allowable claims 1, 14, and 28 and are therefore also allowable. For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Serial No. 09/760,560

Reply to Final Office Action of October 28, 2005

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,275,546 B1, in view of Szczepanek, U.S. Patent No. 5,517,638. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 6 and 19 depend from allowable claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are therefore also allowable. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,275,546 B1, in view of Swoboda, U.S. Patent No. 5,790,609. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 7 and 20 depend from allowable claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are therefore also allowable. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,275,546 B1, in view of Swoboda, U.S. Patent No. 5,790,609, and further in view of Schwake, U.S. Patent No. 6,782,064 B1. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 8 and 21 depend from allowable claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are therefore also allowable. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 13, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,275,546 B1, in view of Watt, U.S. Patent No. 5,675,615. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 13, 27, and 30 depend from allowable claims 1, 14, and 28, respectively, and are therefore also allowable. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,275,546 B1, in view of Schwake, U.S. Patent No. 6,782,064 B1. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 32 depends from allowable claim 28, and is therefore also allowable. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Serial No. 09/760,560

Reply to Final Office Action of October 28, 2005

Claim Objections

Claims 10-12, and 24-26 are objected to as depending upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has cancelled claims 10 and 24, incorporating their limitations into their respective independent claims 1 and 14. Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining objections.

Claims 11-12 and 25-26 depend from allowable claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are therefore also allowable. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and rejections have been adequately addressed, that all pending claims are allowable, and that the case should be advanced to issuance.

If the Examiner has any questions, Applicant encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Schafer, Reg. No. 45,078

Date: 11/21/2005

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
1111 Louisiana Street
44th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: (713) 220-5800
Facsimile: (713) 236-0822